




rather than merely making it available for inspection at the office of their counsel. The Court finds that SAS has failed to show that inspection of the WPS software at WPL's counsel's office would be unduly burdensome. The Court notes WPS's representation that the distance between the offices of counsel for Plaintiff and the offices of counsel for WPL, where the WPS software was made available for inspection, is roughly two city blocks. (Dkt. No. 161 at 1.)

Defendants' Motion to Compel Contentions asks the Court to compel more specific Infringement Contentions from Plaintiff that specify the alleged infringement of certain claim limitations. The Court finds that Plaintiff had adequately specified the components of the accused product that it contends meet these limitations.

For these reasons, the motions are **DENIED**.

**So ORDERED and SIGNED this 15th day of January, 2020.**

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
RODNEY GILSTRAP  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE